arXiv:1403.0604v1 [physics.chem-ph] 3 Mar 2014

Quantum Monte Carlo for Noncovalent Interactions: Analysis of Protocols and Simplified Scheme Attaining Benchmark Accuracy

Matúš Dubecký,[a,*] **René Derian,**[b] **Petr Jurečka,**[a,*] **Lubos Mitas,**[c] **Pavel Hobza,**[d,a] **Michal Otyepka**[a]

Reliable theoretical predictions of noncovalent interaction energies, which are important e.g. in drug-design and hydrogen-storage applications, belong to longstanding challenges of contemporary quantum chemistry. In this respect, the fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo (FN-DMC) is a promising alternative to the commonly used "gold standard" coupled-cluster CCSD(T)/CBS method for its benchmark accuracy and favourable scaling, in contrast to other correlated wave function approaches. This work is focused on the analysis of protocols and possible tradeoffs for FN-DMC estimations of noncovalent interaction energies and proposes a significantly more efficient yet accurate computational protocol using simplified explicit correlation terms. Its performance is illustrated on a number of weakly bound complexes, including water dimer, benzene/hydrogen, T-shape benzene dimer and stacked adenine-thymine DNA base pair complex. The proposed protocol achieves excellent agreement (∼0.2 kcal/mol) with respect to the reliable reference. The work thus enables easier use of the quantum Monte Carlo to tackle noncovalent interactions with benchmark accuracy.

1 Introduction

Noncovalent interactions between molecular complexes and/or their parts are of key importance in many areas of chemistry, biology and materials science[1–3]. Their striking manifestations include the properties of liquids, molecular recognition[4] or the structure and function of biomacromolecules, to name just a few[2,5]. In general, experiments make it possible to obtain information on the strength of noncovalent interactions e.g. from dissociation and adsorption enthalpies. Nevertheless, direct information on their nature is usually unavailable. In order to characterise the noncovalent interaction/s of interest more precisely, one typically resorts to a combination of multiple techniques[1,6]. Theory and high-accuracy calculations here usefully complement experiments by providing the detailed information necessary for their fundamental understanding. As the binding energies of noncovalent complexes are weak (typically 0.5 to 30 kcal/mol in small complexes) when compared to a typical covalent bond energy (100 kcal/mol), their computations require methods of exceptional quality. For benchmark purposes, only approaches with a degree of accuracy beyond the accepted chemical accuracy (1 kcal/mol) are considered reliable enough. Ideally, the level of subchemical accuracy[7] (0.1 kcal/mol) should be reached. This task poses a long-standing challenge to modern computational chemistry.

The established "gold standard" of the quantum mechanical calculations of noncovalent interaction energies[8] has been the CCSD(T)[9] (coupled-cluster singles and doubles with perturbative triples) method, which guarantees the desired accuracy, provided that large enough basis sets and/or complete basis set (CBS) extrapolations are employed. The benchmark capability of CCSD(T)/CBS has recently been verified on a set of small noncovalent complexes by a higher-order CCSDT(Q) method[10] and in small bases also by the CCSDTQ, CCSDTQP and full CI (configuration interaction)[11]. Nevertheless, because of the rapid growth of the CCSD(T) computational cost in the basis set size, $\propto O(N^7)$, and even the more steeply growing demands of higher-order coupled-cluster approaches, their practical use remains limited to relatively small systems[12–16]. For summary of developments in this field, cf. Ref. 17.

A promising alternative to solve the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation for electrons in Born-Oppenheimer approximation is the fixed-node (FN) diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC/FN-DMC) method, a member of the quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) class of methods based on random sampling. FN-DMC solves an imaginary-time Schrödinger equation projecting out the exact ground-state within the constraints given by the nodal surface ($\Psi_T = 0$) of the best available trial wave function (Ψ_T), required to preserve the antisymmetry of the simulated electronic state[18,19]. The FN-DMC approach is favourable for its direct treatment of many-body correlations (competitive to high-order approaches including full CI)[18,19], low-order polynomial scaling $\propto O(N^{3-4})$[18] with the number of electrons and its intrinsic massive parallelism[18,19]. The representation of a wave function as an ensemble of walkers (electron real space position vectors) in QMC results in a CBS-equivalent mode and energies that are insensitive

[a] Regional Centre of Advanced Technologies and Materials, Department of Physical Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Palacký University Olomouc, tř. 17 listopadu 12, 771 46 Olomouc, Czech Republic.
[b] Institute of Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dúbravská cesta 9, 845 11 Bratislava, Slovakia.
[c] Department of Physics and CHiPS, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA.
[d] Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Flemingovo nám. 2, 166 10 Prague 6, Czech Republic.
[*] E-mail: matus.dubecky@upol.cz, petr.jurecka@upol.cz

to basis set superposition errors (possibly present in Ψ_T)[19]. QMC makes it possible to sample sophisticated many-body wave function ansätze with explicit inter-electronic dependencies efficiently, as the wave functions are sampled stochastically[18–21]. On the other hand, it suffers from disadvantages like slowly convergent error bars intrinsic to stochastic sampling, the need to circumvent the difficulties in sampling antisymmetric wave functions and/or complicated estimations of quantities beyond energies. Despite this, QMC approaches are behind some of the most paradigmatic results obtained for quantum systems such as the correlation energy of electron gas[22], widely used in computational electronic structure methods. For more details and background on QMC, we refer the reader to the published reviews[18,19,21].

In the domain of noncovalent interactions, there are two salient features of FN-DMC. First, the method accurately describes the dynamic correlation effects crucial for noncovalent interactions, since it recovers *all possible many-body correlations* within the constraints given by the nodal surface[18]. Second, the finite FN error of Ψ_T used in DMC is expected to cancel out in energy differences nearly exactly[23–26], because the nodes in the region of the molecule *A* are essentially unchanged by the presence of the weakly interacting molecule *B* and vice-versa. This trend has been qualitatively confirmed by a direct inspection of nodal surfaces[26]. For these reasons, FN-DMC based on single-determinant trial functions (containing e.g. Kohn-Sham orbitals) has been found very promising in small/medium[25–27] and medium/large molecular systems[3,28–33], where conventional correlated methods are inapplicable due to the prohibitive computational cost. Although systematic understanding of error cancellation in QMC energy differences is still far from complete, the data accumulated to date begin to delineate the method performance for various types of systems[26,34,35]. For more detailed presentations, see Refs. 19,23,25 and 26.

In our previous study in this field[26], we demonstrated the ability of the FN-DMC to reach the CCSD(T)/CBS within 0.1 kcal/mol on a teaching set of six small noncovalent complexes: the dimers of ammonia, water, hydrogen fluoride, methane, ethene and ethene/ethyne complex. The successive procedure was subsequently tested on complexes of benzene/methane, benzene/water and T-shape benzene dimer, where the FN-DMC deviated by no more than 0.25 kcal/mol with respect to the best available CCSD(T)/CBS interaction energy estimates. In a way, QMC performed much better than expected a priori[25]. Note that the genuine accuracy of CCSD(T) for these sizable systems has not yet been confirmed to subchemical accuracy at a higher level (CCSDT(Q)), and both approaches therefore provide independent interaction energy estimates that agree remarkably well. In addition, extended basis sets (e.g. aug-cc-pVTZ) are unavoidable here, because small sets lead to qualitatively incorrect results[10]. For more of the complexes considered in the current work, such calculations are prohibitively expensive and if the FN-DMC calculations prove to be accurate enough, this route immediately provides new means for adressing of such difficult problems.

In the present work, we analyze the possible FN-DMC approaches and tradeoffs and report on a considerably cheaper and yet accurate scheme based on a two-body explicit correlation (Jastrow) factor, which is a simplification with respect to the traditionally used three-body Jastrow term. The use of the two-body explicit correlation is indeed not a new idea, though the discovery of its ability to attain $\sim$0.2 kcal/mol accuracy in case of noncovalent interactions as reported in the current work represents an important advance. The favourable performance of the simplified scheme also directly confirms the previous observation that the fixed-node error cancellation is the main reason for the success of the one-determinant FN-DMC in weakly bound noncovalent complexes[26].

2 Molecular Complexes

The calculations reported below were performed on a diverse set of hydrogen-bonded and/or dispersion-bound complexes for which reliable estimates of interaction energies exist[10,12,14]. The teaching set consists of the dimers of ammonia, water, hydrogen fluoride, methane, ethene and the ethene/ethyne complex as in our previous work to allow a convenient comparison. The larger complexes used for testing purposes include benzene/H_2, benzene/methane, benzene/water, T-shape benzene dimer and stacked adenine-thymine complex. The selection of the benzene/H_2 is largely motivated by our future interest in related systems, namely the assessment of interaction energies between carbon-based materials and H_2, useful for hydrogen-storage applications. The adenine-thymine complex, on the other hand, serves as the first stringent test of our approach in DNA base-pair interactions, and for future reference in the assessment of interactions in larger DNA fractions.

3 Analysis of QMC Protocols

The development of a FN-DMC-based methodology leading to accurate noncovalent interaction energies involves extensive testing and elimination of biases that affect the final results. Indeed, this has to be done in a stepwise manner since several sets of parameters enter the multistage approach[36,37]:

i) The ansatz for the trial wave function Ψ_T must be selected first. The "standard model" and frequently used choice is the Slater-Jastrow[18,19] functional form, a product of determinant(s) and an explicit correlation term (Jastrow factor), as employed here. Then it is necessary to choose an effective

Table 1 The FN-DMC interaction energies E (kcal/mol) obtained from various tested protocols compared to the CCSD(T)/CBS reference E_R (kcal/mol). The protocol-type attribute, if applicable, is indicated in the column P. For clarity, analyzed features of the protocols with respect to the standard[26] 3tJ protocol are indicated by the bold typeface. Abbreviations: Ψ_T - trial wave function, LC - a linear combination of energy (95%) and variance (5%), Δ - the difference with respect to the reference, Dis. - a distinct Jastrow factor (see text).

Complex	E_R	P	Ψ_T			VMC opt.	FN-DMC		
			Basis set	Method	Jastrow	cost function	timestep/a.u.	ECP treatment	E
Ammonia dimer	-3.15[a]		TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.33±0.07[b]
			QZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.47±0.07[b]
		3tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.10±0.06[b]
			aug-QZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.13±0.07[b]
			aug-TZV	**HF**	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.12±0.07[b]
		2tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-3.15±0.05
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-3.14±0.05
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	**Variance**	0.005	T-moves	-3.28±0.04
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-3.22±0.07
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	**Locality**	-3.27±0.07
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	**0.01**	**Locality**	-3.39±0.06
Water dimer	-5.07[a]	3tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-5.26±0.08[b]
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-5.13±0.08
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**3tJ Dis.**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-5.15±0.08[b]
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**3tJ Dis.**	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-5.26±0.08
		2tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-5.24±0.09
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ Dis.**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-5.50±0.08
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-5.33±0.09
Methane dimer	-0.53[a]	3tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-0.44±0.05[b]
			aug-QZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-0.55±0.04
			aug-TZV	**HF**	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-0.52±0.10
		2tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-0.60±0.07
			aug-TZV	**HF**	**2tJ**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-0.64±0.08
Ethene dimer	-1.48[a]	3tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-1.47±0.09[b]
			aug-QZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	0.005	T-moves	-1.54±0.09
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	3tJ	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-1.42±0.09
		2tJ	aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	0.005	T-moves	-1.54±0.09
			aug-TZV	B3LYP	**2tJ**	LC	**0.01**	T-moves	-1.55±0.09

[a] Takatani et al.[14], [b] Dubecký et al.[26]

core potential (ECP, if any) and a basis set (e.g., aug-TZV). Subsequently, the Slater determinant(s) are constructed with DFT, Hartree-Fock (HF) or post-HF orbitals. Finally, terms included in the Jastrow factor[20] must be specified. They include, for instance, electron-electron (ee), electron-nucleus (eN), and electron-electron-nucleus (eeN) terms, which contain explicit functional dependence on inter-particle distances and thus efficiently describe dynamic correlation effects[18].

ii) The variational (VMC) optimisation step consists of the selection of the VMC cost function and a parametric optimisation of Ψ_T, which may or may not include adjustment of the nodal surfaces. It is possible to improve the nodes by the re-optimisation of the orbitals and/or determinant expansion coefficients.

iii) The final FN-DMC ground-state projection calculations depend, in addition to the Ψ_T optimised in step ii), on the parameters of the DMC simulation itself, including an imaginary time step, the treatment of ECPs, the target walker population/s and target error bar/s, to name but a few most important.

In general, the parameters and/or choices in all points, i) to iii), affect the final interaction energies obtained after the production DMC simulations in iii), as the differences of the statistically independent total-energy expectation values (with associated error bars). The parameters in i) and ii), in addition to the energies accumulated during DMC runs, modify also the energy variance, thus determining the length of the DMC simulations to reach the fixed target statistical accuracy.

Tab. 1 shows the representative setups and the related results that helped us to trace the importance of the parameter changes considered and identify useful protocols; here, the preceding one[26] is labelled 3tJ and the new one 2tJ. These differ in the number of terms (ee, eN and eeN, vs. ee and eN) considered in the Jastrow factor (cf. the Methods). The key observations from Tab. 1 may be summarised as follows.

3.1 Basis Sets

In the ammonia dimer complex, where the reference interaction energy amounts to -3.15 kcal/mol[14], the TZV and QZV bases result in interaction energies of -3.33±0.07 and -3.47±0.07 kcal/mol, whereas the aug-TZV and aug-QZV bases lead to FN-DMC interaction energies of -3.10±0.06 and -3.13±0.07 kcal/mol[26], respectively. The presence of augmentation functions in Ψ_T is therefore crucial[24], whereas an increase of the basis set cardinality beyond the TZV level seems to play a smaller role than in the standard methods of quantum chemistry. In the water dimer, methane dimer and ethene dimer complexes, the aug-TZV data are found to be

statistically indistinguishable from the aug-QZV data as well. Since the aug-TZV basis set reaches the reference data within 0.1 kcal/mol in the whole teaching set considered[26], we have used it throughout the study.

Note that the aug-QZV basis set with approximately two times more basis functions than the aug-TZV lowers the energy variance. For example, in the methane dimer complex, the variance is improved by 0.01 a.u. (from 0.19 to 0.18 a.u.), decreasing the sampling needed to reach the same error bar by about 10%. Nevertheless, the cost of the aug-QZV calculations, for the fixed number of DMC steps is three times higher, making the aug-TZV approach still much more favourable when considering the overall cost/accuracy ratio.

3.2 Orbitals in the Slater Part of Ψ_T

Since the FN-DMC energies depend primarily on the nodal surface of the trial wave function Ψ_T, we tested HF and B3LYP sets of orbitals in Slater determinants. In the ammonia dimer complex[26], we found that the HF and B3LYP orbitals provide FN-DMC interaction energies that are indistinguishable within the error bars, namely -3.12±0.07 vs. -3.10±0.06 kcal/mol, and both in good agreement with the CCSD(T)/CBS reference (-3.15 kcal/mol[14]). Similar conclusions apply in the case of methane dimer, separately in both types of the schemes considered, 2tJ and 3tJ alike. The total energies from B3LYP orbitals were always found to produce variationally lower total energy expectation values[38,39] than those from HF (e.g. in ammonia dimer by ∼0.001 a.u.). This indicates better quality of the B3LYP nodal surfaces and therefore we used B3LYP orbitals for the rest of the calculations as well. We note that the results are expected to depend on the choice of the orbitals only very weakly due to the favourable FN error cancellation that takes place in weakly interacting complexes[23–26]. Similar behaviour should be expected also in studies of *noncovalent interactions* between open-shell systems, where complete-active-space wave functions may be employed to capture multi-reference effects[40,41].

3.3 Jastrow Factor

The considered variations of the Jastrow term include the reduction of terms (2tJ, cf. the Methods) with respect to the previously reported version (3tJ), and the so-called distinct Jastrow factor including distinct parameters (3tJ Dis.) on the non-equivalent atoms of the same type. We have found, that e.g. in ammonia, water and ethene, 2tJ and 3tJ protocols generate approximately the same results. On the other hand, this is not the case in the methane dimer. The water dimer is an example where the 3tJ Jastrow factor is not sufficient and the corresponding interaction energy (-5.26±0.08 kcal/mol) deviates considerably from the reference (-5.07 kcal/mol[14]). In order to reach subchemical accuracy margin, a distinct 3tJ Jastrow correlation factor must be considered (3tJ Dis.,-5.15±0.08 kcal/mol). The result obtained by the 2tJ scheme combined with the distinct feature (2tJ Dis., Tab. 1), is too off (-5.50±0. 08 kcal/ mol) probably because of the insufficient number of sampling points used in VMC optimisation (cf. Ref. 42). A reasonable compromise between the accuracy and cost is thus provided by the 2tJ scheme (-5.24±0.09 kcal/mol), which is acceptable within the target error of 0.2 kcal/mol.

Since the 2tJ scheme costs a fraction of the 3tJ, it may be useful in large complexes. For comparison, in ethene- and benzene-dimer complexes, the 2tJ DMC calculations were found to be about five times faster than the 3tJ ones, whereas the variances arising from the lower variational flexibility of Ψ_T changed comparatively little: from 0.194 to 0.226 a.u. and from 0.472 to 0.546 a.u., respectively. These changes led to a drop of the statistical sampling efficiency by ∼25% in both cases. In larger molecules (more electrons/species/Jastrow basis functions), the 2tJ scheme would be much cheaper than in the discussed case for its general quadratic scaling compared to the general cubic scaling of the 3tJ/3tJ Dis. schemes (cf. Ref. 21 for technical details).

3.4 VMC Cost Function

The variance used as a cost function in VMC optimization of the Jastrow term parameters leads to higher FN-DMC total energies when compared to energy minimisation (with 95% of energy and 5% of variance, cf. the Methods)[43]. For example, test calculations employing variance minimisation in ammonia lower the energy variance, as expected, but the total energy remains higher (by 0.0012 a.u. in dimer), and the interaction energy produced in this way (-3.28±0.1 kcal/mol) also deviates more from the reference. We thus recommend using a large fraction of energy in the VMC-optimisation cost function.

3.5 DMC Time Step

For completeness, we explore time step of 0.01 a.u. in addition to our standard conservative time-step setting of 0.005 a.u., used to avoid the extrapolation of energy to a zero time step[25]. A conclusive discussion of this point is, however, not possible because the error bars do not allow statements of statistical significance. Neither do we thus attempt zero time step extrapolations; we discuss the observations only qualitatively. In ammonia dimer, we have observed a deterioration of the final interaction energies in the case of 3tJ with an increase of the timestep, whereas in the case of 2tJ, no apparent dependence arises. In the case of water dimer, the calculation of energies using an increased time step shows that only the

3tJ Dis. scheme is able to approach the reference in the zero time step limit. In ethene dimer, there is no significant dependence on the time step in either of the cases considered (2tJ and 3tJ). The time step of 0.005 a.u. is accurate enough for our purposes and it is used throughout the study.

3.6 ECP Treatment in DMC

In order to reduce the numerical cost of the calculations, we have removed core electrons using ECPs. In ammonia dimer, we have found that the T-moves[44] scheme used to treat ECPs in DMC produces more accurate results than the locality approximation[45] (where the error reaches $\sim$0.2 kcal/mol), as expected, and we have thus combined it with a short time step (0.005 a.u.).

3.7 Summary

To summarise the discussion related to the analysis of protocols and tradeoffs relevant in calculations of noncovalent interactions, we conclude that for general setups, the main group elements and the target $\sim$0.3 kcal/mol accuracy (in small systems, or formally per one bond), the use of the following scheme (2tJ protocol) is recommended: i) single-determinant trial wave functions of Slater-Jastrow type using B3LYP orbitals and an aug-TZV basis set, ii) an exhaustively optimised Jastrow factor (keeping the Slater determinant intact) with ee, and eN terms, and, iii) a FN-DMC ground-state projection using the T-moves scheme[44] and a time step of 0.005 a.u. The error bars should be converged to 0.1-0.2 kcal/mol to obtain statistically meaningful results. To this end, DMC projection times of several thousands of a.u. with large walker ensembles are unavoidable.

4 Benchmarks

The production FN-DMC results obtained by the scheme involving simplified Jastrow term (2tJ) are reported and compared to the CCSD(T)/CBS and more traditional protocol (3tJ) data in Tab. 2. The mean error (ME) and the mean unsigned error (MUE) of the 2tJ scheme, with respect to the CCSD(T)/CBS reference data, are both found to be about 0.1 kcal/mol respectively and the mean relative error (RE) reaches 4.9%. The maximum interaction energy deviations with respect to the reference reach ~ 0.2 kcal/mol, observed in hydrogen-bonded water and hydrogen-fluoride dimers. For comparison, the MUE of the FN-DMC results obtained with the 3tJ scheme amounts to 0.08 kcal/mol (RE: 4.8 %) and the maximum deviation of ≈ 0.2 kcal/mol is obtained only in the case of water dimer. This may be further improved by the distinct Jastrow factor (cf. Tab. 1)[26] as already mentioned. The remaining values differ by no more than 0.1 kcal/mol from the reference.

The favourable performance of the 2tJ scheme is further demonstrated when it comes to larger complexes, where MUE amounts only to 0.2 kcal/mol (RE: 4.4%). Overall, the data in Tab. 2 clearly show that the faster 2tJ scheme is able to attain benchmark results, close to the subchemical accuracy in most systems. These results also presumably indicate, that efficient FN-error cancellation[26] takes place in the considered set of complexes, and, that the relative error of our approach does not noticeably increase with the size of the system, which is important for use in large complexes.

We note in passing that in the case of the benzene/H_2 complex, we report our own CCSD(T)/CBS reference value of -1.033 kcal/mol (Tab. 2), obtained by a standard CBS extrapolation/correction technique (cf. the Methods) which improves upon the existing value of -1.037 kcal/mol[46].

In a few cases, the new protocol agrees better with the coupled-cluster reference than the preceding one (3tJ). Based on an analysis of the total energies and variances, which are both lower, we conclude that the 3tJ scheme is more accurate but both protocols provide similarly converged energy differences. The fine discrepancies between the approaches lie in the statistical noise and much more work would be required in order to elucidate the nature of these small variations.

5 Conclusions

The analysis of the QMC FN-DMC-based protocols and related tradeoffs provided in this work revealed a favourable computational scheme based on a simplified explicit correlation Jastrow term. The tests on a number of complexes including up to a stacked DNA base pair show a good performance and nearly sub-chemical accuracy with respect to CCSD(T)/CBS, consequently enabling an easier access to reliable estimates of interaction energies in larger complexes. The protocol itself is not new, nevertheless the discovery of its high accuracy in the domain of noncovalent interactions, as demonstrated above, represents an important advance.

In the future work, we plan exhaustive assessment of the FN-DMC-based approaches on a set of noncovalent complexes A24[10], for which the most accurate CCSD(T)/CBS interaction energies to date exist (including CCSDT(Q), core correlation and relativistic effects corrections), in order to ascertain limits of the method before application to truly large complexes.

Since the QMC is not limited to single-reference and "gas-phase" complexes and in noncovalent systems relies on the fixed-node error cancellation, the reported protocol may readily find application in cases that are intrinsically difficult for mainstream-correlated wave-function approaches. These include estimates of noncovalent interactions between open-

Table 2 The FN-DMC interaction energies E (kcal/mol) obtained by the new protocol based on simplified Jastrow factor (2tJ, cf. section 3), compared to the CCSD(T)/CBS reference interaction energies E_R (kcal/mol) and conservative 3tJ protocol data[26], along with the corresponding differences Δ and statistics: mean error (ME, kcal/mol), mean unsigned error (MUE, kcal/mol) and relative unsigned error (RE,%), for each subset and the whole considered set (total), respectively.

Complex	E_R	E/3tJ[d]	Δ_R	E/2tJ[c]	Δ_R
(teaching set)					
Ammonia dimer	-3.15[a]	-3.10±0.06	-0.05	-3.21±0.09	0.06
Water dimer	-5.07[a]	-5.26±0.08	0.19	-5.28±0.10	0.21
Hydrogen fluoride dimer	-4.62[b]	-4.68±0.10	0.10	-4.77±0.12	0.19
Methane dimer	-0.53[a]	-0.44±0.05	-0.09	-0.60±0.07	0.07
Ethene dimer	-1.48[a]	-1.47±0.09	-0.01	-1.53±0.13	0.05
Ethene/ethyne	-1.50[a]	-1.56±0.08	0.06	-1.54±0.14	0.04
		ME:	0.033	ME:	0.104
		MUE:	0.083	MUE:	0.104
		RE:	4.78	RE:	4.94
(test set)					
Benzene/H_2	-1.03[c]	-	-	-1.08±0.10	0.04
Benzene/water	-3.29[a]	-3.53±0.13	0.24	-3.21±0.15	-0.08
Benzene/methane	-1.45[a]	-1.30±0.13	-0.15	-1.50±0.15	0.05
Benzene dimer T	-2.71[a]	-2.88±0.16	0.17	-2.53±0.23	-0.18
Adenine-Thymine S	-11.66[a]	-	-	-11.00±0.30	-0.66
				ME:	-0.167
				MUE:	0.203
				RE:	4.44

[a] Takatani et al.[14], [b] CCSDT(Q), Řezáč et al.[10], [c] This work. [d] Dubecký et al.[26],

shell organometallic and/or metal-organic systems (using simple multi-determinant trial functions), studies of periodic models like physisorption on metal surfaces and 2D materials, or prediction of noncovalent crystal stability[31].

In the domain of noncovalent interactions, the quantum Monte Carlo FN-DMC method therefore appears to be very promising for its benchmark accuracy, low-order polynomial scaling with the system complexity, low memory requirements and nearly ideal scaling across thousands of proccessors[47] in parallel supercomputing environments.

Methods

The geometries of the studied complexes were taken from the S22 set[12], except for the hydrogen fluoride dimer[10] and benzene/H_2[46]. ECPs with the corresponding basis sets developed by Burkatzki et al.[48] were used throughout the work, with the exception of the H where a more recent version was used[49]. Augmentation functions were taken from the corresponding Dunning bases[50]. Single-determinant Slater-Jastrow[20] trial wave functions were constructed using B3LYP or HF orbitals from `GAMESS`[51]. The Schmidt-Moskowitz[52] homogeneous and isotropic Jastrow factor[20], including either the electron-electron and electron-nucleus terms (2tJ), or 2tJ with electron-electron-nucleus terms in addition (3tJ), was expanded in a fixed basis set of polynomial Padé functions[21]. The parameters of the positive definite Jastrow factor were optimised by the Hessian driven VMC optimisation of at least 10x10 iterations (i.e. a full VMC energy calculation after each 10 optimisation steps on a fixed walker population), using the variance optimisation[53] or a linear combination[43] of energy (95%) and variance (5%) as a cost function. The optimised trial wave functions were subsequently used in the production FN-DMC runs performed with a time step of 0.01/0.005 a.u. within the locality approximation[18,45] (LA, for testing purposes) or using the T-moves scheme[44] for the treatment of ECPs beyond LA. The target walker populations ranged from 5k (for small systems) up to about 20k (for the largest system). All QMC calculations were performed using the code `QWalk`[54].

The reference interaction energy for the benzene/H_2 complex was estimated by the basis set superposition error corrected standard CBS extrapolation technique[12] from HF/aug-cc-pV5Z, MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ/aug-cc-pV5Z and CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pVQZ results.

Acknowledgements

M.D. is grateful to Claudia Filippi for sharing an improved effective core potential for H and valuable discussions. The support from the Operational Programme (OP) Research and Development (R&D) for Innovations - European Regional Development Fund (ERDF, project CZ.1.05/2.1.00/03.0058) and the OP Education for Competitiveness - European Social Fund (projects CZ.1.07/2.3.00/30.0004 and CZ.1.07/2.3.00/20.0058) is gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported by the grant P208/10/1742, from the Czech Science Foundation (P.J.). R.D. acknowledges support from grants APVV-0207-11 and VEGA (2/0007/12). L.M. is supported by NSF OCI-0904794 and ARO W911NF-04-D-0003-0012 grants and by XSEDE computer time allocation at TACC. The calculations were in part performed at the Slovak infrastructure for high-performance computing (projects ITMS 26230120002 and 26210120002) supported by the OP R&D funded by the ERDF. Access to computing and storage facilities owned by parties and projects contributing to the National Grid Infrastructure MetaCentrum, provided under the programme "Projects of Large Infrastructure for Research, Development, and

Innovations" (LM2010005), is greatly appreciated.

References

1 P. Hobza and K. Müller-Dethlefs, *Non-Covalent Interactions*, The Royal Society of Chemistry, 2010.

2 K. E. Riley, M. Pitoňák, P. Jurečka and P. Hobza, *Chem. Rev.*, 2010, **110**, 5023–5063.

3 S. Grimme, C. Diedrich and M. Korth, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2006, **45**, 625–629.

4 L. M. Salonen, M. Ellermann and F. Diederich, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 4808–4842.

5 V. Georgakilas, M. Otyepka, A. B. Bourlinos, V. Chandra, N. Kim, K. C. Kemp, P. Hobza, R. Zbořil and K. S. Kim, *Chem. Rev.*, 2012, **112**, 6156–6214.

6 P. Lazar, F. Karlický, P. Jurečka, M. Kocman, E. Otyepková, K. Šafářová and M. Otyepka, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2013, **135**, 6372–6377.

7 M. S. Schuurman, S. R. Muir, W. D. Allen and H. F. Schaefer III, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **120**, 11586–11599.

8 P. Hobza, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **45**, 663–672.

9 K. Raghavachari and G. W. Trucks, *Chem. Phys Lett.*, 1989, **157**, 479–483.

10 J. Řezáč and P. Hobza, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 2151–2155.

11 L. Šimová, J. Řezáč and P. Hobza, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 3420–3428.

12 P. Jurečka, J. Šponer, J. Černý and P. Hobza, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **8**, 1985–1993.

13 R. Podeszwa, K. Patkowski and K. Szalewicz, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **12**, 5974–5979.

14 T. Takatani, E. G. Hohenstein, M. Malagoli, M. S. Marshall and C. D. Sherrill, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **132**, 144104.

15 J. Řezáč, K. E. Riley and P. Hobza, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2011, **7**, 2427–2438.

16 J. Brndiar and I. Štich, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2012, **8**, 2301–2309.

17 M. S. Gordon, D. G. Fedorov, S. R. Pruitt and L. V. Slipchenko, *Chem. Rev.*, 2012, **112**, 632–672.

18 W. M. C. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R. J. Needs and G. Rajagopal, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 2001, **73**, 33–83.

19 B. M. Austin, D. Y. Zubarev and W. A. Lester, *Chem. Rev.*, 2012, **112**, 263–288.

20 R. Jastrow, *Phys. Rev.*, 1955, **98**, 1479–1484.

21 M. Bajdich and L. Mitas, *Acta Phys. Slovaca*, 2009, **59**, 81–168.

22 D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1980, **45**, 566–569.

23 M. Mella and J. B. Anderson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2003, **119**, 8225–8228.

24 C. Diedrich, A. Lüchow and S. Grimme, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **123**, 184106.

25 M. Körth, A. Lüchow and S. Grimme, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2008, **112**, 2104–2109.

26 M. Dubecký, P. Jurečka, R. Derian, P. Hobza, M. Otyepka and L. Mitas, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 4287–4292.

27 N. A. Benedek, I. K. Snook, M. D. Towler and R. J. Needs, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **125**, 104302.

28 B. Santra, A. Michaelides, M. Fuchs, A. Tkatchenko, C. Filippi and M. Scheffler, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **129**, 194111.

29 J. Ma, D. Alfé, A. Michaelides and E. Wang, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **130**, 154303.

30 A. Tkatchenko, D. Alfé and K. S. Kim, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2012, **8**, 4317–4322.

31 K. Hongo, M. A. Watson, R. S. Sánchez-Carrera, T. Iitaka and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2010, **1**, 1789–1794.

32 K. Hongo, T. C. Nguyen and R. Maezono, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 1081–1086.

33 D. Alfè, A. P. Bartók, G. Csányi and M. J. Gillan, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **138**, 221102.

34 F. R. Petruzielo, J. Toulouse and C. J. Umrigar, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **136**, 124116.

35 K. Rasch, S. Hu and L. Mitas, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **140**, 041102.

36 M. Dubecký, R. Derian, L. Horváthová, M. Allan and I. Štich, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 20939–20945.

37 L. Horváthová, M. Dubecký, L. Mitas and I. Štich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2012, **109**, 053001.

38 J. Kolorenč, S. Hu and L. Mitas, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2010, **82**, 115108.

39 M. C. Per, K. A. Walker and S. P. Russo, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2012, **8**, 2255–2259.

40 F. Schautz and C. Filippi, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **120**, 10931–10941.

41 M. Dubecký, R. Derian, L. Mitas and I. Štich, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **133**, 244301.

42 A. Zen, Y. Luo, S. Sorella and L. Guidoni, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 4332–4350.

43 C. J. Umrigar and C. Filippi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2005, **94**, 150201.

44 M. Casula, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2006, **74**, 161102.

45 L. Mitas, E. L. Shirley and D. M. Ceperley, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1991, **95**, 3467–3475.

46 M. Rubeš and O. Bludský, *ChemPhysChem*, 2009, **10**, 1868–1873.

47 R. J. Needs, M. D. Towler, N. D. Drummond and P. L. Riós, *J. Phys.-Cond. Mat.*, 2010, **22**, year.

48 M. Burkatzki, C. Filippi and M. Dolg, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2007, **126**, 234105.

49 M. Dolg and C. Filippi, *Private communication.*

50 T. H. Dunning Jr., *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1989, **90**, 1007–1023.

51 M. W. Schmidt, K. K. Baldridge, J. A. Boatz and et. al., *J. Comput. Chem.*, 1993, **14**, 1347–1363.

52 J. W. Moskowitz and K. E. Schmidt, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1992, **97**, 3382–3385.

53 N. D. Drummond and R. J. Needs, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2005, **72**, year.

54 L. K. Wagner, M. Bajdich and L. Mitas, *J. Comp. Phys.*, 2009, **228**, 3390–3404.